Fransis Thomson (Antwerpen)

THE EULOGY OF ST. JOHN THE DIVINE ATTRIBUTED TO JOHN THE EXARCH OF BULGARIA

In 1960 I. Iufu drew attention to a *Eulogy of St. John the Divine* in the 1359 Bulgarian Germanus Florilegium where it is ascribed to the 9th—10th century Bulgarian writer John the Exarch.[1] In 1965 having studied the contents of the *Eulogy* D. Ivanova-Mircheva concluded that it was evidence of the "hohe philosophischtheologische Bildung des Exarchen" and announced her intention of editing it[2]. The following year the same scholar pointed out that the first part of the *Eulogy*, an exegesis of John i, 1—4, in content is very similar to the treatment of the same theme in the first homily of John the Exarch's *Hexaemeron*, which she considered to be further proof of the latter's authorship of the *Eulogy*[3].

The second part of the *Eulogy* consists of an episode describing how John the Divine saves a robber chief from his sin and the Eulogy itself mentions Clement of Alexandria as the source for this account. Ivanova-Micheva on the basis of a comparison of the Clementine version and the „Exarchan" concluded that John the Exarch had turned the original dry, monotonous account into an emotional, dramatic dialogue[4]. In 1967 P. Olteanu took up the question of the source of this episode and concluded that at the basis of the *Eulogy* was not the original Clementine version but a later one found in the Metaphrastan vita of St. John, although with some reminiscences of yet another version found in the synaxarium[5]. He further examined the language of the *Eulogy*, which he concluded could not only be dated to the 9th—10th century but was also typical of other works of John the Exarch[6].

In 1971 Ivanova-Mircheva's promised edition appeared: the text is that of the Germanus florilegium with, in the footnotes, variants taken from a 16th—17th Russian florilegium containing an abridged version[7]. At the same time she carried out a systematic linguistic analysis which confirmed Olteanu's dating[8], but she disagreed with his opinion about the source of the robber episode because of the considerable differences between the accounts[9].

The attribution of the Eulogy to John the Exarch was questioned in 1974 by H. Keipert who poitned out that, in the first place the first exegetic part of the *Eulogy* is extremely similar to the pseudochrysostomian *Encomium in S. Joannem evangelistan*[10] and that, in the second place, the Greek version closest to the episode of the robber in the second part is that found in Anastasius Sinaita's *Oratio in sextum psalmum*[11] from which he concluded:

a) It is an open question whether a Greek or a Slav compiled the *Eulogy*[12];
b) if a Slav, it is possible though unlikely, that he used already translated texts of his sources for his compilation[13];
c) John the Exarch cannot be considered the author[14];
d) Whether the latter compiled or translated the *Eulogy* is uncertain since there are no reliable linguistic criteria for ascribing a translation to him and to nobody else[15].

In 1978 Ivanova-Micheva published a different version of the first exegetic part of the *Eulogy* as found in a 15th century Serbian codex[16]. This she considered to be a revision of the frst part of the *Eulogy* which could linguistically be dated to the period of the Second Bulgarian Empire[17].

Although Keipert had pointed out that the abridged version of the *Eulogy* is to be found as one of the entries for 26th September in the *Great Menologium* compiled for Metropolitan Mecarius in the 16th century[18], it had not been noted in their description of the *Great Menologium* published in 1884 A. Gorsky and K. Nevostruyev had pointed out that the full version of the *Eulogy* and the second version of the first part are both found as entries for 8th May; moreover they had indicated that the abridgment of the full version found for 26th September had been so crudely done as to render the *Eulogy* in places incomprehensible and finally they considered that the second version of the first part was a different, younger translation of the untraced Greek original of the *Eulogy*[19].

The present article has three purposes: firstly, to draw attention to a larger number of MSS of all three versions, a necessary prerequisite for a critical edition; secondly, to examine the nature of the relations of the individual parts of the *Eulogy* to their Greek originals and to the Slav translations of the latter; thirdly, to return to the question of the possibility of attributing the compilation to John the Exarch. In an appendix the value of the Germanus florilegium for the text of the *Eulogy* is briefly discussed.

The full version of the *Eulogy* is found in the following MSS:

1. The Bulgarian florilegium copied in 1359 for an otherwise unknown Metropolitan Germanus, library of the Rumanian Patriarchate, Bucharest, codex slav. no. 1, ff. 30r—40v[20]:
   Похвала ѕ҃ватаго апостола и ев҃аггелиста Іѡана богословца, сътворено Ѥѡаномъ Ѥ҃сархомъ Блъгарскымъ („Пакы намъ прииде великын єдиныи богословець. . .“)[21]
   This is the sole MS of any version to ascribe it to John the Exarch.
2. A late 14th century Serbian synaxarium cum menologium for December to August in the Archives of the Jugoslav Academy of Sciences, Agram, no. III s 22, ff. 253v—257r[22]:
   Похвала светаго апостола и еѵаггелиста Иоана Богослова („Пакы намь сь сиь прінде великін іединін богословць. . .“)
3. A late 14th century Serbian panegyricon, SHM, A. Khludov collection no. 195, ff. 343r—347v.[23] Title and incepit as in no. 2[24]
4. A 15th century May cum November (sic) menologium, LSL, f.304 (collection of the Trinity Laura of St. Sergius) no. 669, ff. 13r—17r[25]:
   Похвала ѕ҃ватаго апостола и ев҃аггелиста Іоана, сътворено простнуемъ. („Пакы намъ съ ѕ҃ватын прпінде великін єдинъ и богословець“).
   This is the first MS with this title and incepit which are to be found in the later MSS of this version[26].
5—7. The three May volumes of Macarius' *Great Menologium*, viz. the Sophia copy placed in the library of the Cathedral of St. Sophia, Novgorod, in 1541; the Dormition copy placed in the church of the Dormition, Moscow, in 1552, and the Imperial copy of s. 1550 made for Ivan IV[27].
8. A Russian panegyricon of 1567, LSL f. 113 (collection of the Dormition monastery of St. Joseph of Volokolamsk) no. 487 I, ff. 136v—140r[28].
9. A 16th centry Russian May menologium, LSL f. 173 (Moscow Theological Academy collection) no. 199, ff. 158r—163v[29].
10. A 16th century Russian May menologium, SPL f. 573 (collection of St. Petersburg Theological Academy) no. 1375, ff. 162r—169r[30].

The abridgment of this version is in the following MSS:

1. A 15th—16th century Russian panegyricon, SPL f.588 (M. Pogodin collection no. 957, f. 13r—v (the text is defective, only the beginning being preserved)[31]:
   Преставленне Іоанна богослова
   („Пакн намъ съ небесъ прнде велнкін Іоанъ. . .")
2. A 16th century Russian panegyricon, LSL f. 256 (Count N. Rumyantsev collection) no. 436, ff. 48v—54v. Title and incepit as in no. 1.
3. A 16th century Russian panegyricon, LSL f. 37 (T. Bol'shakov collection) no. 66, ff. 176v.189v. Title and incepit as in no. 1[33].
4. A 16th century Russian panegyricon, SPL f. 588 (M. Pogodin collection) no. 953, ff. 40v—47v[34]:
   Слово на памѧть славнаго н всехвалнаго апостола н еѵанггелнста Іѡанна богослова. („Пакы намъ съ небесъ прінметъ велнкін Іѡаннъ. . .")

5—7. The three September volumes of Macarius' *Great Menologium*. Titles and incepits as in no. 4[35].

8. A 16th—17th Russian florilegium, CSHA, Synodal Archives no. 1306, ff. 95r—106v[36]:
   Преставленне Іоанна богослова („Пакн к намъ съ небесъ прннде велнкін Іоанъ. . .")
9. A 16th—17th Russian florilegium, NLS, no. 320, ff. 24v—27v[37]:
   Преставленіе Іѡана богослова еѵаггелнста
   (.Пакн намъ с небесн прінде велнкін Іѡванъ. . .")
10. A Russian florilegium of 1634, CSAEA, f. 381 (Cynodal Typography collection) no. 9 (392), ff. 245v—30r[38]:
    Преставленне Іоанна богослова („Пакн н намъ с небесъ прннде велнкін Іоанъ. . .")
11. A 17th century Russian panegyricon, LSL f. 37 (T. Bol' chakov collection) no. 421 II, ff. 651v—656r. Title and incepit as no. 1[39].

The second version of the first part of the *Eulogy* is found in the following MSS:

1. A 15th century Serbian florilegium, RAS codex slav. no. 153, ff. 275—277r[40]:
   Нже вь светнхь wтца нашега Іѡанна архіепнскопа Кѡнстантінѣ града Златоѵстаго, Похвалное светому Іѡанноѵ богословѵ н еванггелнстѵ.
   („Пакы намь wт небесь прінде еднпь н велнкыін богословь. . .")

As these are the title and incepit in almost all MSS except for minor variants, e.g. of orthography, only major variants are given.

2. A 15th century Russian florilegium, LSL f. 304 (collection of Trinity Laura of St. Sergius) no. 746, ff. 189r—193r[41].
3. A 15th century Russian florilegium, LSL f. 304 (collection of the Trinity Laura of St. Sergius) no. 754, ff. 90r—94v[42].
4. A 15th century Moldavian panegyricon in the convent at Dragomirna, Rumania, no. 700, ff. 152r—155r[43].
5. A 15th century Russian florilegium, SPL f. 588 (M. Pogodin collection) no. 857, ff. 190r—194v[44].
6. A 15th century Moldavian florilegium, RAS codex slav. no. 305, ff. 227v—230r[45].
7. A 15th—16th century Russian florilegium, LSL f. 310 (V. Undol' sky collection) no. 560, ff. 219r—221r[46].
8. A Bulgarian florilegium of 1509, SPL f. 182 (A. Hilferding collection) no. 56, ff. 385v—388v[47].

9. A 16th century Russian florilegium, SPL f. 573 (collection of St. Petersburg Theological Academy) no. 1357, ff. 194v—198v[48].

10—12. The three May volumes of Macarius' *Great Menologium*. Titles and incepits as in no. 1 except that in the title it is called: Слово похвалное святому[49]. . .

13. A 16th century Serbian florilegium, BAS no. 85, ff. 114r—116r[50].
14. A Russian panegyricon of 1567, LSL f. 113 (collection of the Dormition monastery of St. Joseph of Volokolamsk) no. 487 I, ff. 133r—135r[51].
15. A 16th century Moldavian panegyricon in the convent at Dragomirna, Rumania, no. 739, ff. 79r—83r[52].
16. A 16th century Russian florilegium, LSL f. 304 (collection of the Trinity Laura of St. Sergius) no. 83, ff. 93r—97v[53].
17. A 16th century Russian panegyricon, LSL f. 304 (collection of the Trinity Laura of St. Sergius) no. 199, ff. 255v—263r[54].
18. A 16th century Russian florilegium, SHM, collection of the monastery of the Miracle of the Archangel Michael, no. 261, ff. 230r—235v[55].
19. A Russian May menologium of 1630, LSL f. 304 (collection of the Trinity Laura of St. Sergius) no. 676, ff. 190r—195v. Title and incepit as in no. 1 except that in the title it is called: Слово похвално святому[56]. . .
20. A 17th century Serbian florilegium formerly in the National Library, Belgrade, no. 195, ff. 163r—165v[57].
21. A 17th century Russian florilegium, UAS, collection of Metropolitan Makary Vulgakov no. 34 (Aa 173), ff. 31—7r[58].
22. An 18th century Russian panegyricon, SAS no. 33. 1. 10, ff. 327r—329r[59].
23. A Russian panetylicon of 1720, SAS, f. 31 (Northern collection) no. 512, ff. 327r—329r. Title and incepit as in no. 19[60]

It is certain that more MSS of the various versions will be traced and it is probable that further research will reveal the presence of variant redactions and excerpts. Thus a 16th—17th century florilegium, SPL f. 588 (M. Pogodin collection) no. 951, ff. 220v—223v, contains a Ukrainian redaction of the second version of the first part of the *Eulogy*[61], while a 17th century Russian florilegium, UAS, collection of Prince Bezborodko's Institute of History and Philology at Nezhin no. 17, ff. 255r—261r, contains what appears to be an excerpt from the abridgment of the full version[62]. In view of the similarity of the incepits it is also possible that closer examination of the codices will require in some cases a revision of the above classification.

As yet no critical edition is available of any of the three versions: the full version has been edited on the basis of a single MS, viz. the Germanus florilegium[63] its abridgment on the basis only of Macarius' *Great Menologium*[64], and the second version of the first part of the full version on the basis also of but one MS, viz. RAS cod. slav. no. 153[65].

The full version of th *Eulogy* is composed of five main parts:

i. an exegesis of John i, 1—4, which forms approximately one half of the entire *Eulogy*[66]. This is the part which is also found in a second version;
ii. a description of the rescue of the leader of a robber band from sin by St. John, which comprises about half of the remainder of the *Eulogy*[67];
iii. a short account of te destruction of the temple of Artemis at Ephpesus and the resurrection of the pagan priest's brother[68];
iv. a short description of John's death and burial together with the accompanying miracles[69];

v. a brief concluding eulogy of the saint[70].

The first part is virtually a literal translation of the pseudochrysostomian *Encomium in S. Joannem, evangelistam*[71], whose theme of the difference between the ἐποίησε of Genesis and the ἦν and ἐγένετο of St. John's Gospel is common enough in patristic exegesis of John i, 1—4[72], including works translated into Slovonic[73]. The immediate source which inspired the anonymous author of the *Encomium* is Severian of Gabala's *In mundi creationem orationes vi*[74], which also served as one of the sources for John the Exapch's *Hexaemeron*[75]. However, a comparison of the Slav text of the *Eulogy* with the Slav *Hexaemeron* shows that there is no direct link between them[76].

The *Encomium* was included in the premetaphrastan menologium for 26th September but was excluded from the metaphrastan revised menologium[77] and is thus rarely found; in all only seven MSS have been traced:

1. The 10th century codex Hieros. patr. no. 6, ff. 182r—184v[78].
2. The 12th century codex Vatic. gr. no. 1853, ff. 111, 114, 109, 116, 120, 121[79].
3. The 16th century sodex Hieros. Sab. no. 226, ff. 155v—158r[80].
4. The 16th century codex Sinaiticus gr. no. 1670, ff. 188r—194v[81].
5. The 16th century codex Hieros. patr. no. 134, ff. 121r—125v[82].
6. The 16th century codex Athos Vatopedi no. 425[83].
7. The 17th century codex Athos Protaton no. 87, ff. 97r—103r[84].

As yet the *Encomium* has not been studied or critically edited, the sole edition being based upon a single codex, viz. Hieros. patr. no. 6[85], which, although the earliest, in places has a defective text. The published editions of the Slav versions to some extent enable these defects to be corrected but it is obvious that the value of the Slav versions for the reconstruction of the original will only emerge after the publication of critical editions of both the Greek and the Slav. Nevertheless a comparison even of the published editions clearly reveals the nature of their interrelations.

The first major conclusion to be drawn from such a camparison is that the full version and the second version of the first part are two entirely different translations of the same Greek text, the latter Slav version is thus not a revision of the former. This is clear not merely from a comparison of what they have but also of what they do not have since both used Greek MSS defective in varying respects. To give but one instance:

ὁ εὐαγγελιστής: πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο. ὁ προφήτης: ὁ ὑπάρχων πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων. και πάλιν ὁ ἀπόστολος: εἴτε ἀρχαί, εἴτε ἐξουσίαι, εἴτε θρόνοι, εἴτε κυριότητες, πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ και εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται και αὐτός ἐστι πρὸ πάντων.

For this the first Slavonic translation in the full version only has:

а єѵаггєлистъ, ꙗко тѣмъ все бысть, а пророкъ, сѣи прѣжде вѣкъ,

whereas the second translation has:

єѵаггєлистъ, вьса тѣмь бышє. И пакы апостолъ, ащє власти, ащє престолн, ащє наоѵєла, ащє бласти ащє господства, вьса тѣмь бышє и вь нємь сьздаше сє, и ть ієсть прѣжде вьсѣхъ,[86]

i.e. the second translation omits the quotation of Psalm liv (lv), 19, the first that of Colossians i, 16—17.

The second major conclusion to be drawn is that although both translations adhere closely to the original in construction and word order, the second translation is more literal than the first. Indeed the first translator made a conscious effort to make sense of the Greek even where it was corrupt, whereas the second was content to render it literally, and hence incomprehensibly, e.g.: Τὰ βλάσθημα ἴδε ταῦτα τοῖς αἱρετικοῖς ἐναντία τολμῶσι βαπτίσαι ἐκτος τῆς

παραγγελίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ.
The first translator renders this as a question:
Хоуѧнты вѣсѧ сѫтъ, Како ѧн н смѣѫть крестнтн еретнѯн свѣне повѣленнѧ Христова?
The second translator had a text i which ἴδε read ἰδὲ but otherwise his text is as obscure as the Greek:
Хоуѧнаа, ащѥ же снѧ еретнкѡмь сьпротнвнаа дрьзающінмь крьщатн кромѣ заповѣданіѧ Христова.[87]
In another instance where the first translator has not understood the Greek he has added a gloss to bear out his interpretation:
Καλεῖ γὰρ ἐν ἡμέρα κρίσεως καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ ταὺς λέγοντας τοφ ἦν.
Тогда бо прнзовет Нѡанъ къ сыноу глаголѧщѫѫ не бѣ.
Compare the second translation:
Прнзывает бѡ рь дьнь соудныи Іѡанна н глаголющінхъ ежѥ бѣ[88].
The subject, God, is understood but this the first translator failed to observe and his gloss reveals that he understood John to be the subject[89].
This desire of the first translator to eludicate the teht is also revealed by a whole series of minor glosses, e.g.:
ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἔλεγεν: Монсн бо реѵе (2nd: ѡвь оуѵбѡ глаголащѥ);[90]
πᾶσι: вѣсѣмъ уловѣкомъ слышѫщнмъ (2nd: всѣмь);[91]
ὁ μονογενής: нноуѧцын сынъ (2nd: едннородныи);[92]
εἰκόνας: Ѡбразы н прнклады (2nd: ѡбразы);[93]
ὁ εὐαγγελιδτής: нѡанъ (2nd: еуаггелнсть).[94]
In spite of their close adherence to theGreek text both translations are in the main comprehensible. Exceptions to this are mostly due to corruptions in the Greek texts which they used, only occasionally to translating errors, of which they have but two in common: neither seems to have known that ὁ ἰχθὺων ἀφωνότερος is a metaphor for a bumpkin and both rendered it literally — first: нже рыбъ безъгласнѣн; second нже рыбь безгласнѣнін;[95] neither were they acquainted with the theological term τὸ μὲσον meaning "the difference" between each of the Persons of the Trinity, thus:
Πόσον δέ ἐστι τὸ μέσον αὐτῶν, εἰπέ μοι; χρόνος ἦν τὸ μέσον,
becomes in the first translation:
Колнко естъ межджѫ нма, повѣжджъ мн, о уловѣче, лѣто ѧн бысть посрѣдѣ?
and in the second:
Колнко же ѥсть, уловѣче, посрѣдѣ, рцн мн? Врѣме бѣ посрѣдѣ.[96]
In very many cases the concord of the two published Slav translations allows the corruptions of the published Greek text to be corrected, to give but a few examples:
Ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἐν ἐμοὶ λόγος μετὰ τῆς οὐσίας εἰς τὴν τῆς ψθχῆς. . .
Ꙗкоже бо н еже въ мнѣ слово съсѫщнемъ есть дѫшнынмъ. . .
Ꙗкоже бѡ нже вь мнѣ слово сьсоуѫьствомь ѥсть дѫшевнынмь. . .[97]
Clearly here εἰς τὴν must read ἐστίν.
Εἰ γὰρ τὰ κρίματα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνεζιχνίαστοι αἱ ὁδοι αὐτοῦ.
Ѳлма ѵбо сѫдове божнн ненслѣднін н ненспытнмн, н ненслѣжденін пѫтне его.
Ащѥ бѡ соудбы божіе ненѯслѣднмы н ненспыганы, н ненѯслѣднмын поутіе ѥго[98].
Clearly the Greek must read (cf. Romans xi, 33):
Εἰ γὰρ τὰ κρίματα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνεζιχνίαστα καὶ ἀνεζερεύνητα, καὶ ἀνεζιχνίαστοι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ.
Ὥσπερ ἐργάζεται ὁ Γἱός.
Ꙗкоже дѣлаетъ wтецъ, дѣлаетъ н сынъ.
Ꙗкоже дѣлаеть wтьць, дѣлаеть н сынь.[99]
Thus the Greek must read (cf. John v, 17):
Ὥσπερ ἐργάζεται ὁ πατὴρ, ἐργάζεται καὶ ὁ ὐιός.

With regard to such corruptions of the Greek text, it is clear that the first translator had a better text than the second and in only one case does the latter provide a minor emendation not found in the first translation:
Μὴ εἶπεν ἐνταῦθα ἦν.
ѣда рεчε съ ѣко бѣ.
Не рεчε здѣ бѣ.[100]
Clearly μή must read οὐκ, but even here it is theoretically possible that the second translator did not have a correct text blut himself realized the error and corrected it.
A couple of examples where the printed editions of both the Greek and the second translation reveal corruptions of the text which are corrected by the printed edition of the first are:
καὶ οὐ τεμνόμενος
Тако н богъ словο неwтлѫчнмо.
снце.[101]
Clearly the Greek must read:
οὕτως καὶ ὁ θεὸς Λόγος οὐ τεμνόμενος.
Πανταχοῦ ἦν καὶ οὐδαμοῦ τὸ οὐκ ἦν ἀπὸ λογισμῶν ἀνθρωπίνων.
Вѣсежде бѣ а ннгдеже нѣстъ не бѣ. Да съ wткѫдоу ндвыклъ бѣ?
Wт умыwлѣн уловѣуьскъ.
Вьсоудоу бѣ н ннгдеже не бѣ wт мыслен уловѣуьскыихъ.[102]
Clearly the Greek read:
Πανταχοῦ ἦν καὶ οὐδαμοῦ τὸ οὐκ ἦν. Πόθεν οὖν αὐτος ἔμαθε τὸ οὐκ ἦν; Ἀπὸ λογισμῶν ἀνθρωπίνων.

The second part of the full version recounts the episode of the youth converted by St. John who lapses again into sin to become the leader of a robber band but who is saved a second time by John. This story is first found in s.XLIII of Clement of Alexandria's *Liber quis dives salvetur*,[103] from where Eusebius took it almost verbatim for his *Historia ecclesiastica*,[104] whence Antiochus took it in an abridged form for his *Pandectes scripturae sacrae*.[105] A revised version is found in Anastasius Sinaita's *Oratio in sextum psalmum*[106] and an expanded one in Symeon Metaphrastes' *Commentarius in divum apostolum Joannem evangelistam*.[107] The episode is mentioned by many other writers, both Fathers, such as John Chrysostomus,[108] and historians, such as the anonymous author of the *Chronicon paschale*[109] and George Syncellus[110].

The episode was well known to the Slavs since both Antiochus' *Pandectes*[111] and Anastasius' *Oratio*[112] were translated in the 10th century. The compiler of the *Eulogy* knew of the original source as he introduces his account with the words: Глаголетъ Клнмъ стромаτъскын о семъ Hwанъ.[103]
However, a comparison of the various Greek versions with the *Eulogy* reveals that the latter's immediate source was Anastasius' *Oratio*. This exists in two redactions and it was clearly the first which the *Eulogy* used, to take the beginning as an example:
Глаголетъ Клнмъ Стромаτъскын о семъ Hwанъ вслнцѣмъ, ѣко уча скозѣ грады н прнwедъ въ еднн градъ Аснж, тн обрѣте етера юношж добротож н снлож н лнцемъ н вслнуьствомъ утворена, възлюбнвъ н, н хота душж емоу спастн, оувѣща н, ѣкоже бытн емоу вѣрноу.[114]
In the first Greek redaction this passage reads:
Γράφει γὰρ Κλήμης ὁ ἱστορικὸς Αλεξανδρείας περὶ Ἰωάννου ταῦ θεολόγου, ὅτι πρὸ ἐπί τινα τόπον τῆς Ασιας ἐλθῶν ἐν ταῖς αὐτοῦ περιόδοις ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰωάννης, καί τινα νεανίαν εὑρὼν κάλλει τε καὶ ἰσχύϊ καὶ μεγέσθει κεκοσμηένον, τῆς τούτου ψυχῆς ἐρασθεὶς, νουθετεῖ τοῦτον γενέσθαι πιστόν.

In the second redaction this reads:
Τοιοῦτόν τι μὲν περὶ αὐτοῦ ὁ σόφος ἱστοριογράφος ἔν τινι τῶν αὐτοῦ Στρωματικῶν λόγων διεξέρχεται, ὅτιπερ ἐπί τινα τόπον τῆξ Ασίας ἐλθὼν κατὰ πάροβον, ἐτύγχανε γὰρ ἐπισκεπτόμενος τοὺς πίστους καὶ στηρίζων, διέρχεται τὴν Ασὶαν, τινὰ νεανίαν ἐυρὼν κάλλει σώματος καὶ ἰσχύϊ κοσμούμενον μὲν, οὔπω δὲ κατηχθέντα τὴν πίστιν, οὐδὲ τὴν τῆς σωτηρίας διδαχθέντα ὁδόν. τοῦτον παραινέσεσι πείθει πιστόν.[116]

The difference between the Slav *Eulogy* and the Greek of the first redaction led Keipert to doubt whether the immediate source of the former was indeed this redaction[117]. The question is complicated by the fact that neither redaction of th Greek has been critically edited[118] and well over one hundred MSS of the *Oratio* are known to exist[119]. However, a comparison of the Slav with the printed editions of both Greek redactions does permit the conclusion to be drawn that the compiler of the *Eulogy* did use the first redaction but in a text with some readings of the second, i.e. a contaminated text, cf. (the first Greek redaction being given before the Slav, the second after):

ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη αὐτὸν παραλαβόντες
Въ горѫ понмше
ἐπι τὸ ὄρος αὐτὸν ἀναβιβάσαντες[120].
ὁ δὲ ἐπίσκοπος ἐπὶ τῷ ῥήματι θαμβηθείς
а епнскопъ словесе ѹжасъ сѧ
ὁ δὲ ἐπίσκοπος ἐπὶ τῷ ῥήματι ἐκπλαγείς.[121]
ἄγαγε δή μοι, ὦ ἐπίσκοπε, τον νεανίαν, ὅν σοι. . .
вѣдѫ мі, епнскопе, юношѫ wного, нже тн. . .
ἄγε μοι, φησὶ πάλιν πρὸς αὐτὸν, ὦ ἐπίσκοπε, τὸν νεανίαν ἐκεῖνον, ὅν σοι. . .[122]
πῶς, φήσιν, ἢ ποίῳ θανάτῳ;
како нлн кацѣмъ wбрѧзомъ?
πῶς ἢ ποίῳ τρόπῳ;[123]
κατεδίωκε λέγων. . .
гнаше вѣпіѫ н глаголѧ. . .
κατεδίωκε κράζων μεγάλα καὶ λέγων. . .[124]

The first redaction of Anastasius' *Oratio* was translated into Slavonic in the 10th century[125] and already by the late 12th century this episode of the robber had been excerpted and inserted into the Russian synaxarium for September 26th[126]. However, a comparison of the Eulogy with both the full translation and the synaxarium excerpt reveals clearly that the compiler of the *Eulogy* used the original Greek[127]. To illustrate this the above passage is rendered in the full translation:

Пишетъ бо Климентъ историкъ Александрьскыи о Іоаннѣ Фелозѣ:
пришедъ ученикъ Христовъ Іоаннъ въ градъ Асінскыи, обрѣте красна юношу, добротою и тѣломъ ѹкрашена, и въсхотѣ дѹши его, дабы вѣренъ былъ[128].

The excerpt in the synaxarium is from this translation but has been edited for the purposes of the synaxarium, cf. in the same passage the addition of the epithet "the Divine" to indicate which John is meant:
Пришедъ великыи оученикъ Іоаннъ Фелогъ въ градъ Аѳинскыи, обрѣте тоу оуношю, добра вѣзрастомь и красна wбразомь, и въсхотѣ дѹши іего, добы спасенъ былъ[129].

The Slav translation of Anastasius' *Oratio* is nevertheless not without interest for the later history of the text of the *Eulogy* since the abridged version found in Russian MSS from the late 15th century on clearly used it in its revision of the full version, to give but a few examples:

Eulogy full version (F) : ВЕЛНУЬСТВОМЪ ѵТВОРЕНА
Eulogy abridgment (A) : ВЕЛНУНЕМЪ ѵКРАШЕНА
Oratio-synaxarium (O) : ТѢЛОМЪ ѵКРАШЕНА[130]
F: —
A: НАУА ХАДНТН НА МНОГОЦѢННЬІА ВЕѵЕРЯ
O: НАУАТЪ С ННМН НА ВЕѵЕРЯ МНОГОЦѢННЫ ХОДНТН[131].
F: ТАУЕ СЕТНѢЕ ВЪ ГОРѫ ПОНМШЕ
A: ПОСЛѢДН ЖЕ ПОѣША Н НА ГОРЫ ʒЛНН ТН ДРОѵʒН
O: КОНЕѵЬНѢЕ ЖЕ НА ГОРЫ ПОѣША Н СИН ʒЛІН ДРѵʒН.[132]
F: ЬІКО НʒВѢСТНОѵ ВѢРОВАХ
A: ѢАКО ВѢРНА ПОРѵѵНХЪ
O: ѢАКО ВѢРНА ПОРѵѵНХЪ[133].

The destruction of the temple of Artemis and the resurrection of the priest – and not of the priest's brother as in the account forming th third part of the *Eulogy* – is described in the surviving part of the original apocryphal *Acta Joannis*,[134] but neither these *Acta*, not the various redactions of the later version of them ascribed to John's disciple Prochorus[135] are the source for the *Eulogy*. The various accounts of these events found in the principal vitae of St. John, the menaeon vita known as the *Transitus Joannis Theologi*,[136] the excerpt from Sophronius of Jerusalem's *Laudatio Joannis Theologi* in the synaxalium for May 8th,[137] Symeon Metaphrastes' *Commentarius in divum apostolum Joannem evangelistam*,[138] are all based on the *Acta* ascribed to Prochorus and hence the source for the *Eulogy* remains untraced.

The fourth part of the *Eulogy* contains two common legends associated with John's death and burial: the disappearance of his body from the grave[139] and the hearing dust exuded from his tomb as the result of his breathing in his sleep while awaiting doomsday. The former is already found in Hippolytus of Rome's *De xii apostolis*,[140] while the latter was known to Augustine[141]. Already in the 6th century Ephraem of Antioch made an effort to reconcile the two contradictory legends[142] which are found in the various vitae of St. John: the *Transitus*,[143] Symean Metaphrastes' *Commentarius*[144] and the synaxarium accounts[145]. These vitae are all found in Slavonic,[146] as is Hippolytus'*De xii apostolis*,[147] so that the legends were well known to the Slavs[148]. However, none of these works served as the immediate source for the *Eulogy*.

On the other hand a juxtapastion of the metaphrastan account of the healing dust and the *Eulogy* account reveals a certain parallelism:

Κατὰ γοῦν ἡμέραν	Ѡ̀ѣ ѱѣіѫ̀ѳ̇ѧ ѯWНѠ ѡ̀ѳѣСТАВЛЕНІЕ
ε'κείωην ἐν ᾗ ταῦτα	ЄІМѵ НСА СЕѫ ЖНʒНН ВЪ
ἐγένετο,	БЕСКОНЕѵНѫ̀Ѫ̀, Н ДРѣЖѫ̀ТЪ
πανήγυρις	ЄМОѵ ДЬНЬ ʒѣЛО СЛАВНѢ,
ἐκ παντὸς γένους καὶ	СѣВѣКОѵПѣѫ̀Т Сѧ ѠКРѫ̀ГНІН
ἡλικίας ἁπάσης	НАРОДН
τῷ θεολόγῳ κατὰ τὴν	
Ἔφεσον τελεῖται λαμπρὰ,	
τὴν τῶν ἀστέρων μιμουμένη	ѢАКО Н ʒѵѣʒДЫ НЕБЕСЪНЫѫ̀.
φαιδρότητα.	
Καί τις ἐν τῳ ἱερῷ	НСХОДНТЪ ЖЕ НА ТОМЪ
τούτῳ το*πX, ἐφ ὃν	МѣСТѢ, ГЛАГОЛѦТЪ, НДЕЖЕ
οὗτος μετὰ τοῦ τρίβωνος	ЕСТЪ ЛЕЖАЛЪ НѠАНЪ, ѢАКО
κατεκλίθη, πηγάζει λεπτὴ	Н ПРАХЪ
κόνις καὶ ἀναδίδοται,	ʒЄМНЬН НѦ
θεραπείαν τῷ προσιόντι	ЦѣЛБѫ̀

παντὶ παντὸς ἐπαροῦσα	бѣѳоүѫщінхъ
πάθους. Εν τοίνυν τῇ	
παννήηῳ τῆς ἐκείνου	
ἑορτῆς ὑμνῳδίᾳ ὑπὸ	
τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ	дѣлатъ же пса҃хъ тъ
διακονουμένων τοῖς ἐπὶ	цр҃ъковніи мѫжіе
τοῦτο ἀθροιζομένοις	
πλήθεσι διαδιδομένη. . .	събравшимъ са[149]

After the introduction of the meaphrastan menologium the premetaphrastan vitae not included in it fell into disuse and some were lost. Although this of necessity remains speculative, the above parallelism may indicate that Symeon Metaphrastes and the compiler of the *Eulogy* both used the same source which has since been lost[150]

The attribution of the *Eulogy* to John the Exarch, which is attested solely by the Germanus florilegium, may be examined from three points of view: content, language and style. With regard to content it is clear that the similarity in the exegesis of John i, 1—4 in the *Eulogy* and in John the Exarch's *Hexaemeron* is not evidence for the latter's authorship[151] since both are inspired by the same source, Severian of Gabala's *In mundi creationem orationes vi*[152]. As there is no other evidence of similar convent between the *Eulogy* and other works ascribed to John this criterion provides no support for Johannine authorship.

With regard to the second criterion, language, the most detailed analysis has been undertaken by Ivanova-Mircheva,[153] but much of the evidence she adduced in support of Johannine authorship is invalid since it was not then realized that the *Eulogy* consists largely of translated passages. Some of the alleged bulgarisms are thus Graecisms, e.g. гласъ тъ is merely a literal rendering of τὴν φωνὴν ταύτην and not an instance of a postposed definite article.[154] Or again, the form азъ есмъ сѫи is nota case of the use of the present active participle with the present tense of the auxiliary to indicate continuing action[155] but is simply a translation of Exodus iii, 14: ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν. The use of a phrase such ac цагрѧдинти оустъ is hardly only „a usual expression" of John the Exarch[156] as it renders the common Greek expression ἀποῤῥάπτω τὸ στόμα τινός and is found in many Slav works[157] Neither are the compounds evidence of word formation by John[158] as they are normal calques found in all early Bulgarian works, e.g. многоүастьнъ и многообразнъ is the normal translation for the opening words of the epistle to the Hebrews. Indeed there exist as yet no linguistic criteria in accordance with which a translation or, as in this case, a compilation of translated passages can be attributed to John the Exarch and to no other Bulgarian wretur of his day: only detailed contrastive linguistic analyses of the works of all early Bulgarian authors and translators will provide reliable criteria for the attribution on linguistic grounds of a granslation or work to a particular writer and such contrastive analyses have not yet been made.[159]

With regard to style a differentation must be made between what is due to adherence to the original and what is due to the translator's skill. Thus the separation of adjective from substantive in с тоѫ въсходнтъ славоѫ es inadmissible as evidence for John the Exarch's style[160] as it renders

μετ' ἐκείνης ἀναβαίνει τῆς λέξεως.

On the other hand, some of the original stylistic traits, while evidence of the translator's skill, are not proof that John was the translator; for example, it has frequently been pointed out that while ἐν ἀρχῇ is usually rendered въ начало, it is also found once as искони and once as въ начатокъ.

However, the Slavonic translation of the pseudochrysostomian *Sermo de sancto Joanne Theologo* uses precisely the same variation of в начало and исконн, but to much greater effect[162]

Indeed, the alleged freedom with which the Bible is quoted is not the translator's but the anonymous Greek author's; to give but two of the numerous examples:

John v, 21 : ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ — ꙗкоже бо отьць
Eulogy : ὥσπερ ὁ πατήρ — ꙗко отьць.[164]
John v, 22 : οὐδε γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ κρίνει οὐδένα — отьць бо не сѫдитъ никомоуже.
Eulogy : ἐπειδήπερ ὁ πατὴρ οὐδένα κρίνει — поуто имже отьць нинединомоуже сѫдитъ[165]

In fact in two Biblical quotations the translator made a bad error, which is all the more surprising in that in both cases the Greek *Encomium,* specifically states that it is quoting the Bible: Καὶ ππάλιν ὁ ἀπόστολος: ὧν οἱ πατέρες, καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητός.

И пакы апостолъ: егоже отцн и отъ нньъ же Христосъ по плъти, сѫи надъ въсѣми богъ благословенъ[166]

Obviously in this quotation of Romans ix, 5 егоже must read ихъже, i.e. the Israelites.

Τοῦτο μὲν καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐδίδαξε. Τί εἰπών; Οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, ἀλλ' ἑαθτὸν ἐκένωσε.

Сице мл2126[7] и апостолъ наоучи. Что рекъ? не въсхыщениемъ и҃ъ[168] еже бытн равно богоу, нж сам са поновн.[169]

In his rendering of this quotation of Philippians ii, 6—7, the translator has made the classical error of confusing κενόω with its homophone καινόω (and has hence incidentally given expression to an obvious heresy). In his translation of John of Damascus' *De fide orthodoxa* John the Exarch made precisely this error,[170] although there, since the term is not in its Biblical context, the mistake may well be due to a Greek misspelling.

There remains the question of the actual compilatory method itself. Although he considered it unlikely, Keipert did not exclude the possibility that a Slav compiled the *Eulogy* using already extant Slav translations[171] Since, however, it has been shown that the compiler did not use the Slavonic translation of Anastasius' *Oratio,* this possibility may safely be excluded, leaving open, also in Keipert's view,[172] the more basic question as to whether the compiler was a Greek or a Slav. However, the internal evidence of the *Eulogy* would indicate a Slav and not Greek origin of the compilation: into the first part, i.e. the *Encomium,* has been interpolated a short eulogy of St. John, viz. Иоанъ, вьс҃соуепаѳнан ѡрелз. . . ихъ дѣла и темнаа, which is identical in style to the short eulogy which concludes the first part and serves as a link with the second part, i.e. Anastasius' *Oratio,* viz. велегласныи лькє, Иоане. . . уто тоу тебѣ.[173] The style of these short eulogies is in marked contrast to the rest of the translated text and is very similar to that of other such small eulogies found in other Slav works.[174]

Many of the homilies attributed to John the Exarch are compilations: his *Homily on the Ascension* is based on the pseudochrysostomian *In ascensionem Domini nostri Jesu Christi*[175] and *In ascensionem Domini nostri Jesu Christi sermo iv;*[176] his *Homily on the Transfiguration* is based on Ephraem Syrus' *Sermo in Transfigurationem Domini et Dei Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi*[177] and Proclus' *Oratio viii, In Transfigurationem Domini;*[178] his *Homily for Epiphany* is based on Proclus' *Oratio vii, In sancta Theophanta,*[179] Theodotus of Ancyra's *Homilia in baptisma Domini*[180] and Gregory of Antioch's *Homilia i in sancta Theophania sive*

de Christi baptismo,[181] while his *Homily for the Purification of the Virgin Mary* is based on Cyril of Alexandria's *Homilia iv in Lucam.*[182]

However, whereas some of these homilies, e.g. those on the Ascension and the Transfiguration, may be considered harmonious, carefully constructed compilations, this is not the case with the *Eulogy* which is a concatenation of passages varying in theme, length and style. In this respect Ivanova-Mircheva expressed the theory that the lack of stylistic harmory was due to the fact that the *Eulogy* is an improvisation in which John is carried away by feelings and associations[183] Since the Eulogy is made up of a series of deliberately selected passages from various Greek sources the notion of „improvisation" cannot be retained. Only a stylistic analysis of the entire corpus of compilations attributed to John the Exarch will confirm whether the compilatory style of the *Eulogy* is consonant with or contradictory to the attribution to him. Until this stylistic analysis and the above mentioned contrastive linguistic analyses have been completed the question of the attribution of the *Eulogy* to John the Exarch will remain open.

Appendix: the Germanus florilegium.

This codex has been the object of considerable study since Iufu first drew attention to it in 1960[184] and it has been asserted that it was „carefully copied by a well trained saribe".[185] However, a textological analysis of the *Eulogy of St. John the Divine* reveals an extremely defective text distorted by numerous soribal errors. The text of the abridgment of the full version as found in the 16th century *Great Menologium* of Macarius corrects in numerous instances the errors of the Germanus codex.

The first example is of great importance since it concerns the incepit: the earliest Greek codex, the 10th century codex Hieros. patr. 6, begins: Πάλιν ἠμῖν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐπεδήμπσεν, but the later codices have the plural ἐξ οὐρανῶν which is certainly the original reading since recurrent parallelism is a marked stylistic feature of the Encomium and the second sentence begins: Ἰωάννης ἠμῖν σήμερον ἐξ οὐρανῶν ἐπεδήμησεν.

Russian MSS of the full version of the 15th century and later have the incepit: Пакы намъ съ сѫтыи прнде,

but the two 14th century Serbian MSS have: Пакы намь сь снньпрiиде, while the earliest MS, viz. the Germanus flogilegium of 1359, has: Пакы намъ прiнде[186] Нн фацт нт нс тхе МСС оф тхе абрндгмент шхнцх цонтанн шхат нс цлеарлы тхе орнгннал: Пакн намъ съ небесъ прiиде. Obviously at some early stage an abbreviation for съ небесъ шас мисреад анд бецаме съ синъ, which the scribe of the German florilegium (or its copy of the text) omitted as meaningless in the context and which a later scribe altered to съ сѫтыи in an attempt to make better sense.

A few other examples of the better text of the abridgment in the *Great Menologium* are (the Germanus text first, then the abridgment):

τὴη οἰκουμένην	: мнръ съ: весь мнръ[187]
ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος	: слово: Богъ Слово[188]
τὴν φύσιν	: о съвѣтѣ: естьство[189]
ὁ δὲ ἐπίσκοπος	: реүе: епнскопъ реүе[190]
πίστευσόν μοι	: нмн вдрж: нмн мн вѣрү[191]
πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἀπεκα-	: всѣмъ үеловѣкомъ ѥвнся[192]
λύπτετο : —	
ἐνουθέτει και κατήχει	: казаашүе. үүашє[193]
ἀλλα τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν	: не весь сждъ; нж весь сждъ[194]

German florilegium (or its copy of the text) omitted as meaningless in the context and which a later scribe altered to съ сватын in an attempt to make better sense.

A few other examples of the better text of the abridgment in the *Great Menologium* are (the Germanus text first, then the abridgment):

τὴν οἰκουμένην	: мнръ съ : весь мнръ[187]
ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος	: слово : Богъ Слово[188]
τὴν φύσιν	: о съвѣтѣ : естьство[189]
ὁ δὲ ἐπίσκοπος	: рече : епнскопъ рече[190]
πίστευσόν μοι	: нмн вдрж : нмн мн вѣру[191]
πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἀπεκα-	: всѣмъ человѣкомъ явнся[192]
λύπτετο : —	
ἐνουθέτει καὶ κατήχει	: казаашѱе. ученше[193]
ἀλλὰ τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν	: не весь сждъ; нж весь сждъ[194]

Even in passages which have been omitted in the abridgment it is often easy to correct the Germanus text:

προφητεύομεν	: прнрсчемъ : прорсчемъ[195]
μετὰ ταύτης	: с тобож : с тож[196]
πανταχοῦ	: възведе : въсежде[197]
ὅπου	: нже : нджке[198]
ἐν ἀρχῇ	: начало : въ начало[199]
τινες τῶν αἱρετικῶν	: ерстнзн wтьерстнгъ : стерн wт ьерстнгъ[200]

Whether these errors are due to the carelessness of the scribe of the Germanus florilegium or to the scribe of the MS which he was copying is uncertain, but at all events the Germanus codex does not contain a text suitable as the basis for a critical edition of the *Eulogy of St. John the Divire*.[201]

ABBREVIATIONS

BAS Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia,
BHG Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca, ed. F. Halkin, 3 vols., Brussels 1957, (Subsidia hagiographica vol. 8A), and Auctarium Bibliothecae hagiographicae graecae, ed. F. Halkin, Brussels 1969, (Subsidia hagiographica vol. 47).
CIOI Chteniya v Imperatorskom Obshchestve istorii i drevnostey rossiyskikh pri Moskovskom universitete, 247 vols., Moscow 1846—1848, 1858—1918.
CPG Clavis patrum graecorum, ed. M. Geerard, vols. 2—3, Turnhout 1974—1979.
CSAEA Central State Archives of Early Acts, Moscow.
CSHA Central State Historical Archives, Leningrad.
IIOL Izdaniye Imperatorskogo Obshchestra lyubiteley drevney pis'mennosti, 136 vols., St. Petersburg 1877—1917.
LSL Lenin State, Library, Moscow.
MLS National Library, Sofia.
PG Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca et orientalis, ed. J. Migne, 107 vols. in 171, Paris, 1857—1866.
PL Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina, ed. J. Migne, 221 vols. Paris 1844—1865.
RAS Rumanian Academy of Sciences, Bucharest.
SAS Soviet Academy of Sciensec, Leningrad.
SHM State History Museum, Moscow.
SORY Sbornik otdeleniya russkogo yazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoy (vols. 95—101: Rossiyskoy) Akademii nauk, 94 vols. (viz. 8—101), St. Petersburg 1873—1928.
SPL State Public Library, Leningrad.
UAS Ukrainian Academy of Sciensec, Kiev.
VMC Velikiye Minei Chetii, sobrannyye vserossiyskim mitropolitom Makariyem, 24 vols., St. Petersburg 1868—1904 (vols. 1—9) — Moscow 1901—1916 (vols. 10—24).

FOOTNOTES

[1] I. Iufu, Sbornicul lui Gherman (1359), in: Ortodoxia. Revista Patriarniei Romîne, vol. 12, ii, 1960, 253—275, cf. 260—262.

[2] D. Ivanova-Mircheva, Ein altertümliches Homiliar in mittelbulgarischer Abschrift vom Jahre 1359. (Der German-Kodex), in: Die Welt der Slaven, vol. 10, 1965, 425—438, cf. 431—432.

[3] D. Ivanova-Mircheva, Kliment Okhridski i Yoan Ekzarkh kato zŭzdateli na slova, in. Kliment Okhridski. Sbornik ot statii po sluchay 1050 godini ot smŭrtta mu, Sofia 1966, 243—265, cf. 257.

[4] Ibid. 260.

[5] P. Olteanu, Contribuţii la studiul literaturii omiletice în vechile literaturi ulgară şi română, in; Romanoslavica. Revue des études slavo-roumaines, vol. 14, 1967, 305—358, cf. 321—330.

[6] Ibid 331—337

[7] D. Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan Ekzarkh Bulgarski. Slova, vol. 1, Sofia 1971, 162—184. The only other MSS known to her were those mentioned by Iufu but unavailable when the edition was being prepared.

[8] Ibid 135—161, with a glossary 185—200. (9) Ibid. 119—124.

[10] H. Keipert, Ein neues Werk Johannes des Exarchen? in: Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie, vol. 37, ii, 1974, 356–370, cf. 362: "Wohlgemerkt soll damit nicht gesagt sein, daß gerade dieses griechische Enkomium unserem Ubersetzer als Vorbild gedient hat, wohl aber, daß es in Byzanz offensichtlich Predigten dieser Art gegeben hat, die von Slaven bearbeitet werden konnten, so daß wir uns möglicherweise auch einige der heute zwischen dieser griechischen und der slavischen Textfassung zu verzeichnenden Divergenzen durch eine in solchen Details abweichende griechische Vorlage erklären müssen".

[11] He does not, however, identify Anastasius as the source: "Zwar ist der tatsächliche Vermittler jetzt nicht mehr genau festzustellen, jedoch kann kein Zweifel daran bestehen, daß die Version der Erzählung, die sich bei Anastasios Sinaites findet, der slavischen Fassung sehr nahr nahe steht", ibid. 365.

[12] Ibid. 364, also 369

[13] Ibid. 369

[14] Ibid. 364, also 369

[15] Ibid. 370

[16] Viz. RAS codex slav. no. 153: D. Ivanova-Mircheva, Srednobŭlgarska prerabotka na pokhvalata na Yoan Ekzarkh za Yoan Bogoslov, in: Starobŭlgarska literatura, vol. 4, 1978, 47–54, text: 49–52.

[17] Ibid. 52–54

[18] Keipert, Werk 359.

[19] A. Gorsky and K. Neyostruyev, Opisaniye Velikikh Chet'iikh-Miney Makariya mitropolita vserossiyskogo, in: C 101 vols. 1 (128), 1884, i-xix, 1–64 and 1 (136), 1886, 65–184, cf. 25 and 172–173.

[20] Iufu, Sbornicul 260–262; Ivanova-Mircheva, Homiliar 431. On this MS see also D. Ivanova-Mircheva, Germanov sbornik-bŭlgarski pismen pametnik ot x vek v prepis 1359 g., in: Bŭlgarski ezik, vol. 15, 1965, 308–325; idem, Za arkhaichnostta na Germanoviya sbornik-starobŭlgarski pismen pametnik ot x vek, in: Bŭlgarski ezik, vol. 16, 1966, 495–501; N. Dilevski, Kŭm vŭprosa za proizkhoda na „Germanoviya Sbornik" ot 1359 g., in: Bŭlgarski ezik, vol. 17, 1967, 307–322.

[21] Abbreviations are expanded merely for typographic convenience.

[22] V. Mošin, Cirilski rukopisi Jugoslavenske akademije, vol. 1, Agram 1955, 173.

[23] A. Popov, Opisaniye rukopisey i katalog knig tserkovnoy pechati biblioteki A. I. Khludova, Moscow 1872, 413.

[24] Minor variants, e. g. in orthography, need not be specified here.

[25] Ilary and Arseny (Lobovikov), Opisaniye slavyanskikh rukopisey biblioteki Svyato-Troitskoy Sergiyevoy Lavry, vol. 3, in: C101 vol. 2(109), 1879, 12

[26] Cf. note 24.

[27] Sophia copy: D. Abramovich Opisaniye rukopisey S.-Peterburgskoy Dukhovnov Akademii. Sofiyskaya biblioteka, vol 2, St. Petersburg 1907, 98. Dormition copy: Iosif, Podrobnoye Oglavleniye Velikikh Chetiikh Miney vserossiyskogo mitropolita Makariya, khranyaschchikhsya v Moskovskoy patriarshey (nyne sinodal'noy biblioteke, vol. 2, Moscow 1892, 152. Imperial copy: Gorsky, Opisaniye 172.

[28] P. Stroyev, Opisaniye rukopisey monastryrey Volokolamskogo, Novy Lyerusalim, Savvina-Storozhevskogo i Pafnutiyeva Borovskogo, St. Petersburg 1891 (110L vol. 98).

[29] Sergy (Spassky), Polny mesyatseslov Vostoka, vol. 1, Vladimir 1901, 532.

[30] Abramovich, Opisaniye vol. 2, 281.

[31] The information about the as yet undescribed collections of M. Pogodin and the monastery of the Miracle of the Archangel Michael, Moscow, was supplied by my Bulgarian colleague, Klimentina Ivanova, to whon I here express my gratitude and appreciation for her helpful advice and willing cooperation.

[32] A. Vostokov, Opisaniye russkikh i slovenskikh rukopisey Rumyantsovskogo Muzeuma, St. Petersburg 1842, 693; cf. also note 24.

[33] T. Georgiyevsky, Rukopisi T. F. Bol'shakova, khranyaschchiyesya v Imperatorskom Moskovskom i Rumyantsevskom muzeye, Petrograd 1915, (Opisaniye russkikh rukopisnykh sobraniy, vol. 1); cf. also note 24.

[34] Cf. note 31.

[35] Sophia copy: Abramovich, Opisaniye vol. 2,22: Dormition copy: Iosif, Oglavleniye vol. 1, Moscow 1892, 61; Imperial copy: Gorsky, Opisaniye 25; cf. also note 24.

[36] A. Nikol'sky, Opisaniye rukopisey, khranyaschchikhsya v Arkhive Svyateyshego Pravitel-'stvuyuschchego Sinoda, vol. 2, St. Petersburg 1902, 82.

[37] B. Tsonev, Opis na rŭkopisite i staropechatnite knigi na Narodnata biblioteka v Sofiya, Sofia 1910, 282. The variants to the full version are given from this MS by Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1, 163–166, 173–183.

[38] A. Orlov, Bibliotheka Moskovskoy Sinodal'noy tipografii, part 1: Rukopisi, vol. 1: Sborniki, Moscow 1896, 58.

[39] Georgiyevsky, Rukopisi op. cit.; cf. also pote 24.

[40] P. Panaitescu, Manuscrisele slave din biblioteca Asademiei PRP, vol. I, Bucharest 1959, 2137
[41] Ilary, Opisaniye, vol. 3, 139
[42] Ibid. 152.
[43] Z. Iufu, za desettomnata kolektsiya Studion. (Iz arkhiva na rumŭnskiya izsledvach Yon Yufu), in: Studia balcanica, vol. 2, 1970, 299—342, cf. 314.
[44] Cf. note 31.
[45] A. Yatsimirsky, Slavyanskiye i russkiye rukopisi rumynskikh bibliotek, in: SORY vol. 79, 1905, 473.
[46] V. Undol'sky, Slavyano-russkiye rukopisi V. M. Undol'skogo, opisannyye samın sostavitelem i byvshem vladel'tsem sobraniya s No 1-go po 579-y, Moscow 1870, 416.
[47] B. Angelov, Neizvestni rŭkopisi na Mardary Rilski, in: Izvestiya na Instituta za literatura, vol. 21, 1972, 43—65, cf. 54.
[48] Abramovich, Opisaniye vol. 3, St. Petersburg 1910, 25.
[49] Sophia copy: Abramovich, Opisaniye vol. 2, 98; Dormition copy: Iosif, Oglavleniye vol. 2, 152; Imperial copy: Gorsky, Opisaniye 173.
[50] Kh. Kodov, Opis na slavyanskite rŭkopisi v biblioteka na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite.Sofia 1969, 207.
[51] I.e. the same MS which has the full version (no 8), Strovev, Opisaniye op. cit.
[52] Iufu, Kolektsiya 327.
[53] Ilary, Opisaniye, vol. 1, in: C101 vol. 2 (105), 1878, 72.
[54] Ibid 193.
[55] Cf. Note 31.
[56] Ilary, Opisaniye vol. 3, 28.
[57] S. Matič, Opis rukopisa Narodne biblioteke, Belgrade 1952, (Posebna ızdanja Srpske akademije nauka, vol. 191), 127. This MS was destroyed on 6 April 1941 in an air-raid.
[58] N. Popov, Opisaniye rukopisnykh sobraniy, nakhodyaschchikhsya v gorode Kiyeve, vol. 1, in: C101 vol. 1 (160), 1892, 74.
[59] V. Sreznevsky and F. Pokrovsky, Opisaniye rukopisnogo otdeleniya biblioteki Imperatorskoy Akademii nauk, Part 1: Rukopisi, vol. 2, Petrograd 1915, 404.
[60] V. Sreznevsky, Opisaniye rukopisey i knig, sobrannykh dlya Imperatorskoy Akademii nauk v Olonetskom kraye, St. Petersburg 1913—81—82.
[61] Слово похвалное святому ѡѡанну богослову и еуггелисту. („Знову нам з неба пришол еден великим ѡѡанн. . .“), cf. note 31.
[62] Слово Іоанна Богослова („Скажи же о единнамъ грѣшници да чрязумѣнте какѵ. . .“). M. Speransky, Opisaniye rukopisey biblioteki Istoriko-filologicheskogo instituta Knyazya Bezborodko v gorode Nezhine, Nezhin 1900, 417
[63] Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1, 162—184.
[64] VMC, Sentyabr'dni 25—30, ed. P. Savvaitov, St. Petersburg 1883, 1677—1683.
[65] Ivanova-Mircheva, Prerabotka 49—52.
[66] Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1, 162, xvii — 174, iv
[68] Ibid. 179, xx — 182, ii.
[69] Ibid. 182, ii — 183, ix.
[70] Ibid. 183, ix — 184, vii.
[71] BHG no. 932 b; CPG no. 4750; J. de Aldama Reepertorium preudo-chrysostomicum, Paris 1965, (Documents, études et répertoires de l'Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes, vol. 10), no. 378. On two interpolations, probably of Slav origin, ch. infra.
[72] For instance: John Chrysostomus' *Homilia iii in evangelium Joannis*, PG 59, 1859, 37—46, cf. 39—40; Theodore Studites' *oratio ix, Laudatio in S. Joannem apostolum et evangelistam*, ΠΓ 99, 1860, 772—788, цф. 781.
[73] Фор инстанце: Процлус' *Oratio xv, In sanctum Pascha et in illud: 'In principio erat verbum'*, PG 65, 1858, 800—805, cf. 800; the Slav translation is in VMC Sentyabr'dni 25—30, 1674—1677, cf. 1675; Theophylact of Ochrida, *Enarratio in evangelium Joannis*, PG 123, 1864, 1128—1348 and 124, 1864, 9—317, cf. 123, 1136—1137; the Slav translation is in VMC ibid. 1795—2153, cf. 1798.
[74] PG 56, 1859, 429—500, cf. 432—433.
[75] R. Aitzetmüller, Das Hexaemeron des Exarchen Johannes, 7 vols., Graz 1958—1975, cf. vol. 1, 73—77 and compare with Severian, PG 56, 432—436.
[76] As Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1, 125, put it after a comparison of the texts: „Za parŭlno tochni paraleli obache ne mozhe da se govori“.
[77] Cf. the reconstruction of the premetaphrastan September menologium in A. Ehrhard, Uberlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischēn Litetatur der griechischen Kirche von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts. Part 1: Die Uberlieferung, vol. 1, Leipzig, 1937. (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, vol. 50), 452—455; for the contents of the metaphrastan september menologium cf. Efrhard, Uberlieferung vol. 2, Leipzid 1938, (Texte. . . vol. 51), 318—358.
[78] Ἀ. Παπαδόνουλος-Κεπαμεύς, Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ βιβλιοθὴκη vol. 1, St. Petersburg 1891, 23; Ehrhard, Uberlieferung vol. 1, 178.

Ehrhard, Uberlieferung vol. 1, 178.

[79] Anonymous, Ad catalogum codicum hagiographicorum graecorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae supplementum, in: Analecta Bollandiana, vol. 21, 1902, 5—22, cf. 10.

[80] Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Bibliotheke vol. 2, St. Petersburg 1894, 350

[81] V. Veneshevich, Opisaniye grecheskikh rukopisey monastytya svyatoy Yekateriny na Sinaye, vol. 3, part 1, Petrograd 1917, 138.

[82] Paradopoulos-Kerameus, Bibliotheke vol. 1, 231.

[83] Thus Ehrhard, Uberlieferung vol. 3, part. 2, Berlin 1952, (Texte. . . vol. 52, ii), 818, but without indication of folia; but s. Eustradiades and Arcadios of Vatopedi, Catalogie of the Greek Maniscripts in the Library of Vatopedi on Mount Athos, Cambridge (Mass.) 1924, (Harvard Theological Studies, vol. II), 82883, do not list this entry in their description of that codex.

[84] Λ. Πολίτης καὶ Μ. Μανούσακας, Συμπληρωματικοὶ κατάλογοι χειρογράφων Ἁγίου Ὄρους, Θεσαλοωίκη 1973, (Ἑλληνικά Περιοδικὸν σύγγραμα Ἑταιρείας Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶω, τόμος 24), 116.

[85] Ἀρχιμανδρίτης Ἰννόλυτος, Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου ἐγκώμιον εἰς Ἰωάνπν τὸν Εὐαγγελιστήν, Νέα Σιών, τόμος 17, 1922, 665—667, 7258728.

[86] Hippolytos, Ioannou (hereafter G) 726; Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1, (hereatter IS) 170; Ivanova-Mircheva, Prerabotka (hereafter 2S) 51.

[87] G 727; IS 172, 2S 51.

[88] G 726; IS 170; 2S 51.

[89] Keipert, Werk 363, takes Иwанъ to be an early form of the accusative but the gloss does not bear this out.

[90] G 665; IS 163; 2S 49.

[91] G 666; IS 164; 2S 49

[92] Ibidem.

[93] G 666; IS 165; 2S 49

[94] G 727; IS 172; 2S 51

[95] G 666; 2S 166; 2S 49

[96] G 726; IS 169; 2S 50—51

[97] G 666; IS 164; 2S 49

[98] G 666; IS 165; 2S 49

[99] G 727; IS 171; 2S 51

[100] G 667; IS 166; 2S 50

[101] G 666; IS 165; 2S 49

[102] G 726; IS 171; 2S 51

[103] O. Stäblin, Clemens Alexandrinus, vol. 3, Leipzig 1909, (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, vol. 17), 159—199, cf. 187—191:; also in PG 9, 1857, 604—652, cf. 648—652.

[104] Viz. lib. iii, s. 23, ed. G. Bardy, Eusèbe de Césarée, Histoire ecclésiastique, livres i-iv, Texte grec, traduction et annotation, Paris 1952, (Sources chrétiennes, vol. 31), 126—129; also in PG 20, 1857, 45—904, cf. 256—264; other works in which it is found are listed by Bardy, Eusèbe 126n. 4 and F. Braun, Lean le Théologien et son évangile dans l'église ancienne, Paris 1959, 340—341.

[105] Viz. c. 122; PG 89, 1860, 1421—1850, cf. 1812—1817.

[106] PG 89, 1860, 1077—1116 (first redaction), cf. 1105—1109; 1116—1144 (second redaction), cf. 1136—1140.

[107] BHG 919. Ed. PG 116, 1864, 684—705, cf. 693—697.

[108] *Paraenesis i ad Theodorum lapsum*, e.d. PG 47, 1858, 277—308, cf. 305.

[109] L. Dindorf, Chronicon paschale, vol. 1, Bonn 1832, (Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae, vol. 7), 470; also in PG 92, 1860, 69—1028, cf. 608.

[110] *Chronographia*, ed. W. Dindorf, Georgius syncellus et Nicephorus Constantinopolitanus, vol. 1, Bonn 1829, (Corpus scriptorum hustoriae Byzantinae, vol. 41), 653—654.

[111] VMC, Dekabr'den'24, vypusk 13, ed. S. Dolgov, Moscow 1910, 1864—2183, cf. 2150—2151.

[112] On the cf. infra. George Syncellus' *Chronographia* was also translated but when is disputed: V. Istrin, Issledovaniya v oblasti drevnerusskoy literatury, St. Petersburg 1906, 2—34, considers the 11th century but Yu. Trifonov, Vizantiyskiye khroniki v tsŭrkovnoslavyanskata knizhnina, in: Izvestya na Istoricheskoto druzhestvo v Sofiya, vol. 6, 1924, 169—170, dates it to the 14th century; cf. also M. Weingart, Byzantské kroniky v literatuře církevněslovanské, vol. 1, Pressburg 1922, (Spisy filosofické fakulty University Komenského v Bratislavě, vol. 2), 52—55; it is still unpublished. Symeon Metaphrastes'vita was only translated in the early 16th century by Michael Triboles, alias Maximus the Greek, cf. A. Ivanov, Literaturnoye naslediye Maksima Greka. Kharakteristika, âtributsii, bibliografiya, Leningrad 1969, 55. Ed. in VMC Sentyabr'dni 25—30, 1682—1696, cf. 1689—1691.

[113] Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1, 175

[114] Ibid.

[115] PG 89, 1105—1108.

[116] Ibid. 1136.

[117] Keipert, Werk 367.

[118] Both redactions in PG Are taken from editions of the first half of the 17th century, the first from J. Basnage, Thesaurus monumentorum ecclesiasticorum et historicorum, vol. 3, Antwerp 1725, 480 et seq., who had merely reproduced the edition of H. Canisius, Antiquae lectiones, seu antiqua monumenta ad historiam mediae aetatis illustrandam, nunquam edita, omnia nunc primumex manuscriptis edita et nobis illustrata, vol. 3, Ingolstadt 1603, 87—122; the second redaction is from F. Combefis, Graeco-latinae Patrum bibliothecae novum auctarium tomus duplex, alter exegeticus, alter historicus et dogmaticus, Paris, 1648, 943—976. (Comfebis, Patrum 907—942, also has the first redaction taken from Canisius, while Basnage, Thesaurus vol. 3, 502 et seq., also has the second taken from Combefis).

[119] S Sąkkow, Perì 'Anastasimn Sinaitvn, Uessalonikh 1964, ('Episthmonikh epethriw Ueologikhw Sxolhw. Parárthma toỹ n' tómoy), 242—243, lists 110 MSS, 60 of the first redaction (10th to 17th centuries), 18 of the second (also 10th to 17th centuries) and 32 of uncertain redaction (9th to 18th centuries). However, this list is incomplete, e.g. there is a 9th century palimpsest of the first redaction, cf. J. Noret, Le palimpseste „Parisinus gr. 443", in: Analecta Bollandiana, vol. 88, 1970, 141—152, cf. 149.

[120] PG 89, 1108 (hereafter G1); Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1, 176 (hereafter S); PG 89, 1137 (hereatter G2).

[121] G1 1108; S 177; G2 1137.

[122] Ibidem.

[123] G1 1109; S 177; G2 1137.

[124] G1 1109; S 178; G2 1137.

[125] The earliest MS is a 12th—13th century Russian florilegium, LSL f. 304 (collection of Trinity Laura of St. Sergius) I no. 12, ff. 195r—202v, but the text is defective: 3 folia missing after f. 200 and end missing also, cf. I. Sreznevsky, Svedeniya i zametki o maloizvestpykh i neizvestnykh pamyatnikakh, no. 52, in: SORY vol. 12, i, 1874, 203. It is also in the 13th—14th century Serbian Mihanović florilegium, Archives of the jugoslav Academy of Sciences, Agram, no III s. 19, ff. 29v—33r, but these folia are badry damaged, cf. the edition of R. Aitzetmüller, Mihanović Homiliar, Graz 1959, 29v—33r, and in a 13th century Serbian Chrysorrytus, Hilandar no. 22 (386), ff. 135v—147r, cf. K. Ivanova-Konstantinova, Neizvestna redaktsiya na Zlatostruya v sŭbski izvod ot XIII vek, in: Zbornik istorije književnosti. Odeljenje jezika i književnosti, vol. 10, 1976, 89—107, sf. 99. The sole edition is that in VMC Noyabr'dni 13—15. Vypusk vos'moy, St. petersburg 1899, 1920—1924; ibid. 1161—1180 is a later revision of this translation made using the Greek original. K. Ivanova, Tsikl velikopostnykh gomiliy v gomilarii Mikhanovicha, in: Thudyotdela drevnerusskoy literatury, vol. 32, 1977, 219—244, points out that although the translation in the Mihanović and Hilandar MSS is the same, the former seems to have had an abridged text, but unfortunately the homily has not been the object of critical study. Nevertheless a comparison of the *Eulogy* with the edition of the *Opamuo* in the *Great Menologium* shows that the two are antirely unrelated.

[126] Cf. N. Petrov, O proiskhozhdenii i sostave slavyano-russkogo pechatnogo prologa. (Inozemnyye istochniki), in: Trudy Kiyevskoy Dukhovnoy Akademii, vol. 3, 1875, 27; it is edited (unfortunately without the ending) in facsimile from a 13th century Russian synaxarium, SAS no. 4.9.20, by M. Widnäs, Les synaxaires slavorusses des „Fragments Finlandais", Helsingfors 1966, (Commentationes humanarum litterarum Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae, vol. 38, i), 26—27; it is also twice in VMC, Sentyabr'dni 25—30, 1582—1584 and 2163—2164, and in all printed editions of the synaxarium, e.g. Moscow 1817, vol. 1, 60r—v. One of the earliest MSS is the 12th—13th century Russian synaxarium, SPL f. 728 (collection of St. Sophia's cathedral, Novgorod) no. 1324, ff. 185r—186v, cf. Abramovich, Opisaniye vol. 2, 202.

[127] Of the synaxarium version Keipert, Werk 368, writes: „Es ist denkbar, aber nicht mehr mit Sicherheit nachzuweisen, daß eine solche verselbständigte Erzählung — die Geschichte befindet sich a in der Homilie des Anastasios in etwas anderem Zusammenhang — dem unbekannten griechischen oder slavischen Kompilator unserer Predigt vorgelegen hat und von ihm für seine Zwecke leicht bearbeitet worden ist, was manche kleine Unterschiede bei einzelnen Formulierungen bei bewahrtem Aufbau erklären könnte".

However, these can be explained as the results of his using a contaminated text and without hypothesizing an otherwise unknown version. In a 15th century Russian panegyricon, SHM, Count A. Uvarov collection, no. 71 (328), ff. 186v—189v, there is another version of the episode which, to judge by the incepit, has been translated from the second Greek redaction of Anastasius'*Oratio:* Слово дѹѡеполезно о Ноанне богословѣ и о разбоиницѣ спасшемсѧ отъ него („Аще ли же хощете, ною повѣсть скажѹ вамъ, многопрεславное имѹщоу, ѣже Клима спнсатель о Гоанне рεч. . ."), cf. Leonid (Kavelin), Sistematicheskoye opisaniye slavyano-russkikh rukopisey sobraniya Grafa A. S. Uvarova. (So vklyucheniyem 750 nomerov sobraniya I. N. Tsarskogo, opisannykh P. M. Stroyevym v alfavitnom poryadke), vol. 1, Moscow 1893, 428. Cf. the second redaction:

Εἰ δὲ βούλει, καὶ ἑτέραν ἱστοπίαω διηγήσομαι, πολὺ τὸ παράδοξον ἔχουσαν, ἣν Κλήμης ὁ συγγραφεὺς περὶ Ἰωάννου φησί. . . PG 89, 1136 The first redaction reads completely differently, cf. PG 89, 1105.

[128] VMC Noyabr'dni 13—15, 1930. This passage is interesting in that not only does it show that the translation was made from the first Greek redaction, but also that, as in the case of the *Eulogy*, the text used was a contaminated text with some readings of the second redaction, e.g. first red.: κάλλει τε καὶ, ἰσχύϊ καὶ μεγέσθει κεκοσμημένον. Slavonic: добротоıаи тѣломъ украшена. second red.: κάλλει σώματος καὶ ἰσχύϊ κοσμοῦμεωοω.

[129] Widnäs, Synaxaires 26. Naturally some differences between the two passages are due to the fact that the synaxarium excerpt is here quoted from a 16th century MS.

[130] Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1, 175 (hereafter F); VMC Sentyabr'dni 25—30, 1679 (hereafter A); VMC Noyabr'dni 13—15, 1930 (hereafter O).

[131] A 1679; O 1931.

[132] F 176; A 1679; O 1931.

[133] F 177; A 1680; O 1931

[134] R. Lipsius and M. Bonnet, Acta apostolorum apocrypha, vol. 2, pt. i, Leipzig 1898, 151—215, cf. 169—175.

[135] Redaction A ed. T. Zahn, Acta Joannis, Erlangen 1880, 3—165, cf. 42; red. B ed. Lipsius, Acta vol. 2, pt. i, 169—210, cf. 171—172; a mixed red. ed. Amfilokhy (Sergiyevsky), Khozhdeniye po voznesenii Gospoda nashego, Iisusa Khrista, snyatogo apostola i yevangelista Ioanna ucheniye i prestavleniye, spisano Prokhorom uchenikom yego, St. Petersburg 1879 (on cover 1878), (110L vol. 31), 1—67, cf. 18—19. Red. A was translated into Slavonic in the 11th century, ed. from a 15th—16th century Russian MS by Amfilokhy, Khozhdeniye 1—67, cf. 18—19; also in VMC Sentyabr'dni 25—30, 1584—1660, cf. 1602: a facsimile edition of a 15th century Russian MS in N. Likhachev, Khozhdeniye svyatogo apostola i yevangelista Ioanna Bogoslova po litsevym rukopisyam XV i XVI vekov, St. Petersburg 1911, (110L vol. 130), no pagination; a facsimile edition of a late 17th century redaction in Prince P. Vyazemsky, Zhitiye i khozdeniye Ionna Bogoslova, St. Petersburg 1878, (IIOL vol. 23), 3r—96 r.

[136] BHG 919c. Ed. Amfilokhy (Sergiyevsky), Paleograficheskoye opisaniye grecheskikh rukopisey opredelennykh let, vol. 3, St. Petersburg 1880, 19—26; also in all printed editions of the Greek September menaeon, e.g. Athens 1904, 231—235. It was translated into Slavonic not later than in the 13th century, ed. Amfilokhy, Opisaniye vol. 3, 19—26from a 16th—17th century Russian MS; also in VMC Sentuabr'dni 25—30, 2153—2162 and I. Franko, Apokrify i legendy z ukrains'kykh rukopysiv, vol. 3, Lemberg 1902, (Pamyatky ukrains'ko-rus'koi movy i literatury, vol. 3), 49—56 from a 16th century MS, as well as in all printed editions of the synaxarium for September 26th, e.g. Moscow 1817, vol. 1, 55v—59v.

[137] BHG 925 b. Ed. H. Delehaye, Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae e codici Sirmondiano nunc Berolinensi adiectis synaxariis selectis, Brussels 1902, (Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Novembris), 663—664; also in PG 117, 1864, 441. The Slavonic translation ed. from a 15th century Serbian MS by A. Yatsimirsky, Apokrify i legendy. K istorii apokrifov, legend i lozhnykh molitv v yuzhnoslavyanskoy pis'mennosti, vol. 1, Petrograd 1915, 68—69; also in Vyazemsky, Zhitiye 100r-v, Franko, Apokrify vol. 3,68 and all printed editions of the synaxarium for May 8th; e.g. Moscow 1817, vol. 3, 18v—18r.

21[138] Cf. note 107; ed. PG 116, 688; on the Slav translation cf. note 112; ed. VMC Sentyabr'dni 25—30, 1685.

[139] This is, of course, an interpretation of John xxi, 20—23, cf. M. Jugie, La mort et l'assomption de la Sainte Vierge, Rome 1944, (Studi e testi, vol. 114), 710 et seq.; also Zahn, Acta xciii-c.

[140] BHG 153a Ed. PG 10, 1857, 952—953.

[141] *In Joannis evangelium tractatus cxxi*, PL 35, 1845, 1969—1976, cf. 1970.

[142] In his work *Responsio ad Anatolium scholasticum*, which formed book ii of his *De sacrie Antiochiae legibus libri quatuor*. This work has been lost but it was described by Photius in c. 229 of his *Bibliotheca*, PG 103, 1860, 969—1024, cf. 985—988.

[143] Cf. note 136; ed. Athens 1904, 235.

[144] Cf. note 107; ed. PG 116, 703—705.

[145] That for September 26th relates the disappearance of the body, that for May 8th the dust exuded from the tomb, ed. Delehaye, Synaxarium 82 and 665.

[146] *Transitus*, ed. VMC Sentyabr'dni 25—30, 2162; synaxarium 26th September ed. Widnäs, Synaxaires 26; VMC Sentyabr'dni 25—30, 1582; ed. Moscow 1817, vol. 1, 59v; synaxarium 8th May ed. Yatsimirsky, Apokrify vol. 1, 69; ed. Moscow 1817, vol. 3, 19r-v. Maximus the Greek's translation of Metaphrastes'*Commentarius* has a different version to that of the original, cf. VMC Sentyabr'dni 25—30, 1696.

[147] The earliest MS is the 1073 Russian florilegium, SHM, Synodalcollection, no. 31D, ff. 261v—262v; ed. G. Karpov, Izbornik velikogo knyazya Svyatoslava, St. Petersburg 1880, (IIOL vol. 55), 521—523, cf. 522.

[148] Daniel the Palmer in his account of his pilgrimage to the Holy Land reveals a knowledge of them, cf. M. Venevitinov, Zhitiye i khozhdeniye Daniila rus'skyya zemli igumena, 1106—1108 godov, St. Petersburg 1885, 6; he was also acquainted with the *Acta Joannis* ascribed to Prochorus, cf. ibid. 7.

[149] PG 116, 704—705 and Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1, 182—183.

[150] To avoid duplicated research it should be pointed out that none of the following works concerning St. John the Divine is the source: BHG 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913d, 916, 917, 917g, 917h, 917i, 917j, 917k, 917, kb, 918n, 918p. 919, 919c, 919d, 919e, 919f, 919g, 920, 920z, 921, 922, 922i, 923, 924, 925, 925b, 925bb, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 932b, 932m, 932p.

[151] As Ivanova-Mircheva, Kliment 257, claims.

[152] Cf. supra.

[153] Cf. note 8.

[154] As Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1. 137, considered.

[155] Ibid. 142.

[156] Ibid. 150.

[157] Cf. I. Sreznevsky, Materialy dlya slovarya drevne-russkogo yazyka po pis'mennym pamyatnikam, vol. 1, St. Petersburg 1893, 907; also Slovník jazyka staroslověnského, ed. J. Kurz, vol. 1, Prague 1966, 634.

[158] Thus Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1, 135 and 154.

[159] V. Vondrák, O mluvě Jana Exarcha Bulharského. Přispěvek k dějinám církevní slovanštiny, Prague 1896, provides a beginning, but similar studies have to be made of other writers, e.g. Constantine the Presbyter.

[160] Quoted by Olteanu, Contribuţii 336.

[161] Cf. Olteanu, Contribuţii 337 and Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1, 128.

[162] BHG 926. Ed. PG 59, 1859, 609—614; Slav translation ed. VMC Sentyabr'dni 25—30, 1667—1674, cf. 1671—1672.

[163] Cf. Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1, 130—131.

[164] Hippolytos, Ioannou 727; Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1, 171.

[165] Ibid. 726 and 170.

[166] Ibid. 667 and 167.

[167] A scribal error in the Greek MS, both Slav translations show it must read με.

A scribal error in the Germanus florilegium, it must read нєпщєєѧ

[169] Hippolytos, Ioannou 727; Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1, 171.

[170] ἢ πῶς ἑαυτον κενώσας: или како сѧ поневѣ Cf. L. Sadnik, Des Heiligen Johannes von Damaskus „Ἐκθεσις ἀκριβὴς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως in der Übersetzung des Exarchen Johannes, Wiesbaden 1967, (Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris. Fontes et dissertationes, vol. 5), 44.

A third instance in the *Eulogy*, where οἰκοδομῇ is read as οἰκουμένῃ and translated мирѣ, ossyrs not in a Biblical quotation but in a paraphrase of a parable found twice in the Bible, viz. Matthew vii, 24—25 and Luke vi, 48, and hence may be due to a faulty Greek MS, Cf. Hippolytos, Ioannou 728 and Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1, 173.

[171] Cf. note 13.

[172] Cf. note 12.

[173] Viz. Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1, 163, iv-xv and 174, v-175, v.

[174] Especially in the *Homily on the Translation of the Relics of St. Nicholas* and the Eulogy of St. Poul, ed. in.: Kliment Okhridski. Sŭbrani sŭchineniya, vol. 2, ed. B. Angelov et al., Sofia 1977, 125—128, cf. 127, and 432—427, cf. 427. This does not mean that the *Eulogy of St. John the Divine* is to be ascribed to Clement of Ochrida since the ascription of the above two homilies to Clement is, to say the least, dubious.

[175] CPG 4737; de Aldama, Repertorium no. 151.[176] CPG 4534; de Aldama, Repertorium no. 525.

[177] CPG 3939; BHG 1982.

[178] CPG 5807; BHG 1980.

[179] CPG 5806; BNG 1948.

[180] CPG 6135; BHG 1932 f.

[181] CPG 7385; BHG 1926—1927.

[182] CPG 5207, i; BHG 1958w.

[183] Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1, 134.

[184] Cf. note 20.

[185] Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1, 161.

[186] Cf. the list of MSS supra.

[187] Hyppolytos, Ioannou 666; Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1, 164; VMC Sentyabr'dni 25—30, 1678.

[188] Ibidem.

[189] Ibid. 666; 165; 1678.

[190] Ibidem.

[191] PG 85, 1109; 178; 1680.

[192] Hippolytos, Ioannou 666; 164; 1678

[193] PG 85, 1108; 175; 1679

[194] Hyppolytos, Ioannou 726; Ivanova-Mircheva, Yoan vol. 1, 170; this error incidentally gives rise to an expression of heresy, a flat denial of Christ's own words, cf. John v, 22—23.

[195] Ibid. 666; 165
[196] Ibidem.
[197] Ibid. 667; 166
[198] Ibid. 667; 167
[199] Ibidem.
[200] Ibid. 726; 169
[201] The deficiencies of the codex are compounded by misreadings in the edition of the text, to give but three examples, Ivanova-Mircheva's reading first, the correct second: βεβαίως κατέχειν: тєѳѵ дѳдрѣжатι : тєѳрѣдѳ дрѣжатι.
ὑψηλότερα δόγματα: вѧшѣѫѫ поѣѣдı : ѳѧшѣѫѫ повѣдı
εἰς τὸ ὂν: ѳсѧжнмъ : ѳ сѧжнмъ (a scribal error for : ѳ цѫшнмъ),
cf. ibid. 727 and 172; 665 and 163; 667 and 167.